arXiv:1410.6856v1 [math.NT] 25 Oct 2014

Diophantine Inequalities as a Problem of Difference between Consecutive Primes

Felix Sidokhine

October 28, 2014

Abstract

In the present paper, we have developed a method for solving *diophantine inequalities* using their relationship with the *difference between consecutive primes*.

Using this approach we have been able to prove some theorems, including Ingham's exponential theorem as well as some new results. Diophantine inequalities and their connection with Cramer's and Andrica's conjectures are also discussed.

1 Introduction

In the present paper, we have developed a method for solving *diophantine inequalities* using their relationship with the *difference between consecutive primes*.
Our approach to Bertrand's postulate and other problems involving primes is based on using *auxiliary inequalities* and *estimates of difference between consecutive primes*. An *auxiliary inequality* for an *initial inequality* is formulated using prime numbers and should be solved over primes. Here is an example plan of proving a proposition:

Proposition For any integer $n, n \geq 16$ there is a prime number q such that $\frac{n}{2} < q < n - 4$

Auxiliary proposition For any prime $p, p \geq 17$ there is a prime q such that $\frac{p+3}{2} < q < p$

Main proposition If the *auxiliary inequality* is true, then the *initial inequality* is true.

Final proposition The *auxiliary inequality* is true.

In the case of the problems studied in this paper, it seems more efficient to look for an *auxiliary inequality* for their *initial inequality*. In many cases, the proofs will use well-known estimates of the *difference between consecutive primes*, most of which can be found either in the original papers [5], [2] and other facts about primes which can be found in Sierpinski's book [14].

2 Main Results

Using the approach described above, we have been able to prove the following statements:

Bertrand's theorem: For any natural k there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there is a prime number p such that $\frac{n}{2} < p < n - 2k$

Fractional theorem: For any real $k \geq 2$ there is a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for any integer $n > C(k)$ there are at least two primes p, q where $\frac{k-1}{k}n < p, q < \frac{k}{k-1}n$

Exponential theorem: For any real $k \geq 2 + \epsilon$, $\epsilon = \frac{2}{19}$, there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$, there is a prime number p where $(n-1)^k < p < n^k$

Theorem (exponent 3, A.E. Ingham, 1937): There exists a computable constant C such that for each integer $n > C$ there is a prime number p where $(n-1)^3 < p < n^3$.

Strong theorem (exponent 3): There exists a computable constant C such that for each integer $n > C$ there are at the least two prime numbers p, q where $(n-1)^3 < p, q < n^3$.

Brocard's theorem (exponent 3): There exists a computable constant $C(B)$ such that for each pair primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(B)$ there are at the least four prime numbers p, q, r, s where $p_{n-1}^3 < p, q, r, s < p_n^3$.

Strong Brocard's theorem (exponent 3): For any natural k there exists such a constant $C(k)$ that for each prime $p_{n-1} > C(k)$ the interval (p_{n-1}^3, p_n^3) contains at the least $2k$ prime numbers.

Weak Brocard's theorem (exponent 2): There exists a computable constant $C(B)$ such that for each pair neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(B)$ and $(p_n - p_{n-1}) > 3p_n^{\frac{1}{20}}$ there are at the least two prime numbers p, q with $p_{n-1}^2 < p, q < p_n^2$.

For the following statements, we will need to define the notion of *Legendre's prime numbers*.

Definition 1. *A prime p_n is a Legendre prime number if $p_n > a^2 > p_{n-1}$ for some integer a. $\Pi_L = \{2, 5, 11, 17, 29, 37, ...\}$, is the set of Legendre primes.*

Legendre's conjecture: Let for any neighbouring primes p_{k-1}, p_k where p_k is a Legendre prime, the following inequality be true:

$$p_k - p_{k-1} < 2\sqrt{p_k} + 1 \tag{1}$$

then for each integer n there is a prime p such that $(n-1)^2 < p < n^2$.

Legendre's and Andrica's conjecture: Let Andrica's conjecture, $\sqrt{p_k} - \sqrt{p_{k-1}} < 1$, hold for each pair of neighbouring primes p_{k-1}, p_k where p_k is a Legendre prime number, then for each integer n there is a prime p such that $(n-1)^2 < p < n^2$.

Oppermann's and the modified Andrica's conjecture: Let the modified Andrica's conjecture, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n}) = 0$, be true. Then there exists such a constant $C(O)$ that for any

$n > C(O)$ there are at least two primes p, q such that $n^2 < p < n^2 + n$ and $n^2 + n < q < (n+1)^2$.

Diophantine inequality and Cramer's conjecture: Let $p_n - p_{n-1} = O(\ln^2 p_{n-1})$, hold for each pair of neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n (Cramer's conjecture). Then for any real ϵ where $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$, there exists such a constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that for each integer $n > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number p where $(n-1)^{1+\epsilon} < p < n^{1+\epsilon}$.

3 Proof of the Theorems

3.1 Bertrand's theorem

Theorem 1. *For any natural k there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there is a prime p with $\frac{n}{2} < p < n - 2k$.*

Theorem 2. *For any natural k there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each prime $p > C(k)$ there is a prime q with $\frac{p+2k-1}{2} < q < p$.*

Lemma 1. *If Theorem 2 is true, then Theorem 1 is true.*

Proof. Let *theorem 1* be false. Then given a fixed k, there exists a minimal integer n_0 such that the interval $(\frac{n_0}{2}, n_0 - 2k)$ contains no primes.

Let $n_0 - 2k$ be a composite number and let p_{n-1}, p_n be two neighbouring primes such that

$$p_{n-1} < n_0 - 2k < p_n \tag{2}$$

Inequality 2 implies that $p_{n-1} < n_0 - 2k \leq p_n - 1$ or that $n_0 \leq p_n + 2k - 1$.

The interval $(\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, p_n)$ also contains no prime numbers: this is due to the fact that the intervals $(n_0 - 2k, p_n)$ and $(\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, n_0 - 2k)$ do not contain any primes, since $\frac{n_0}{2} \leq \frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}$

Let $n_0 - 2k$ be a prime number. This implies $p_n = n_0 - 2k$. Since the interval $(\frac{n_0}{2}, n_0 - 2k) = (\frac{p_n+2k}{2}, p_n)$ does not contain any prime numbers, hence neither does $(\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, p_n)$ which is a contradiction of theorem 2, assumed to be true. □

Lemma 2. *Theorem 2 is true if and only if every neighbouring prime numbers p_{n-1}, p_n satisfy the following inequality:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} \tag{3}$$

Proof. Let theorem 2 be true. Then, for any given fixed k there is a prime q such that $q \in (\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, p_n)$. We can claim $q \leq p_{n-1}$ and therefore $p_{n-1} \in (\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, p_n)$. Then:

$$p_n - \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} < p_{n-1} < p_n \tag{4}$$

Combining the terms of the inequality, we can obtain:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} \tag{5}$$

Now let the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n - 2k+1}{2}$ be true for some fixed given k. Then we have:

$$p_{n-1} > \frac{p_n + 2k - 1}{2} \tag{6}$$

Therefore $p_{n-1} \in (\frac{p_n+2k-1}{2}, p_n)$ and therefore *lemma 2* holds.

□

Theorem 3. *Bertrand's theorem is true if any pair of neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n satisfy the inequality*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} \tag{7}$$

Proof. Theorem 3 is a consequence of theorems 1 and 2 and lemmas 1 and 2 □

Theorem 4. *For an integer $k \geq 1$ there is a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for any pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$, the following inequality holds:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} \tag{8}$$

Proof. Using the result from [**?**]Dusart) that any $n > 463$, $p_{n+1} \leq p_n(1 + \frac{1}{\ln^2 p_n})$, we have the following inequality:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} \leq \frac{p_{n-1}}{\ln^2 p_{n-1}} < \frac{p_n}{\ln^2 p_{n-1}} \tag{9}$$

Therefore, we need to find an n such that the following inequality is satisfied;

$$\frac{p_n}{\ln^2 p_{n-1}} < \frac{p_n - 2k + 1}{2} \tag{10}$$

Since $\ln(p_n)$ is a strictly increasing function, then there exists such an n_0 that for any $n > n_0 + 1$ this inequality takes place; in this particular problem it is sufficient to take n_0 in such a way that $p_{n_0-1} < 4k < p_{n_0}$. Therefore the inequality will take place for any n greater than $\max(n_0 + 1, 465)$ □

Theorem 5. *Theorem 1 is true for all integers $n > \max(p_r, p_{465})$ where $p_{r-1} < 4k < p_r$.*

Proof. Theorem 5 is a consequence of theorems 2, 3 and 4 as well as lemmas 1 and 2 □

3.2 Exponential Theorem

Theorem 6. *For any fixed real $k \geq \frac{40}{19}$ there exists a constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there is a prime q where $n - (k - \frac{1}{2})n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} < q < n$*

Theorem 7. *For any real number $k \geq \frac{40}{19}$ there exists a natural constant $C(k)$ such that for each prime $p > C(k)$ there is a prime number q where $p - (k - \frac{1}{2})p^{\frac{k-1}{k}} < q < p$*

Lemma 3. *Theorem 6 is true for all integers $n > C(k)$ if and only if theorem 7 is true for all primes $p > C(k)$*

Proof. Let theorem 6 be true, then theorem 7 is true for all primes greater than $C(k)$.

Let theorem 7 be true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(k) < p_r$, but assume theorem 6 is false for some integers. Let n_0 be the minimal integer for which theorem 6 does not hold. This implies that the interval $(n_0 - (k - \frac{1}{2})n_0^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, n_0)$ contains no prime numbers.

Let p_{n-1}, p_n be a pair of neighbouring primes such that $p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$. The the interval $(p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, p_n)$ does not contain any prime numbers. Indeed (n_0, p_n) doesn't have any prime numbers and $(p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, n_0)$ has no prime numbers since it is a subset of $(n_0 - (k - \frac{1}{2})n_0^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, n_0)$ since $n_0 - (k - \frac{1}{2})n_0^{\frac{k-1}{k}} < p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}$. Thus, this allows us to conclude that the interval $(p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, p_n)$ contains no prime numbers, a contradiction with theorem 7 assumed to be true. □

Theorem 8. *The exponential theorem is true if theorem 6 is true.*

Proof. Let theorem 6 be true, then for any integer $n > C(k)$ there exists a prime number p where $n - (k - \frac{1}{2})n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} < p < n$. Let n be equal to $n = [m^k]$. Then there is a prime $p \in ([m^k] - (k - \frac{1}{2})[m^k]^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, [m^k])$. Since $([m^k] - (k - \frac{1}{2})[m^k]^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, [m^k]) \subset ((m-1)^k, m^k)$, then $p \in ((m-1)^k, m^k)$ and theorem 8 is true. □

Theorem 9. *Theorem 7 is true if and only if there is $C(k)$ such that for every pair neighbouring prime numbers $p_{n-1}, p_n \geq C(k)$ satisfies the following inequality:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < (k - 0.5)p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \tag{11}$$

Proof. Let theorem 7 be true for all primes $p_n \geq C(k)$, hence there is a $q \in (p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, p_n)$ such that $q \leq p_{n-1} < p_n$ and p_{n-1} also belongs to this interval. Thus:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n - (p_n - (k - 0.5)p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}) = (k - 0.5)p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \tag{12}$$

Let $p_n - p_{n-1} < (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}$ be true for any pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$, then

$$p_n - (k - 0.5)p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} < p_{n-1} < p_n \tag{13}$$

and p_{n-1} belongs to $(p_n - (k - \frac{1}{2})p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}}, p_n)$, therefore the interval contains a prime number.

□

Theorem 10. *There exists an integer $C(k)$ such that for every pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$, the following inequality takes place:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < (k - 0.5)p_n^{\frac{k-1}{k}} \tag{14}$$

Proof. Using the result from [2]:

> "Theorem 1. For all $x > x_0$, the interval $[x - x^{0.525}; x]$ contains prime numbers. With enough effort, the value of x_0 could be determined effectively."

we can claim that any pair of neighbouring primes $p_n, p_{n-1} > x_0$, which in turn implies that:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} \tag{15}$$

However, inequality 14 is always true for $k \geq \frac{40}{19}$. Therefore $C(k) = p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$. □

Theorem 11. *Theorem 6 is true for all integers $n > C(k) = p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$.*

Proof. Theorem 11 is a consequence of theorems 7, 8, 9, 10 and lemma 3 □

3.2.1 Application of the Exponential Theorem

Theorem 12 (exponent 3, A.E. Ingham [10])**.** *For each integer $n > p_r$, where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$ there is a prime number p where:*

$$(n-1)^3 < p < n^3 \tag{16}$$

Proof. This theorem is true due to theorems 10, 11 since $k = 3 > \frac{40}{19}$ and for all neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > p_r$ the following inequality is satisfied:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < 2.5p_n^{\frac{2}{3}} \tag{17}$$

Hence, the exponential theorem is true and for each $n > p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$ there is a prime number p with $(n-1)^3 < p < n^3$. □

Note: we would like to remark that using our approach in the case $p_n - p_{n-1} = O(p_{n-1}^{\theta})$ where $\theta = \frac{3}{4} + \epsilon$ is Tchudakoff's constant [15] we would not have been able to prove the theorem, however with Ingham's constant $\theta = \frac{5}{8} + \epsilon$ ([11], [6], [10]) we are able to do so.

Theorem 13 (Quasi - Legendre's theorem)**.** *For each integer $n > p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$ there is a prime number p such that the following inequality takes place:*

$$(n-1)^2 < p^{1-\epsilon} < n^2 \text{ where } \epsilon = 0.05 \tag{18}$$

Proof. Let us take $k = \frac{40}{19}$, so for any neighbouring pair $p_{n-1}, p_n > p_r$ the following is satisfied:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{61}{38}p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} \tag{19}$$

As the exponential theorem is true, for each integer $n > p_r$, where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$ there is a prime number p such that $(n-1)^{\frac{40}{19}} < p < n^{\frac{40}{19}}$. This we have $(n-1)^2 < p^{1-\epsilon} < n^2$ where $\epsilon = 0.05$. □

Lemma 4. *There exists a computable constant C such that as n increases and $n > C$ the number of prime numbers in the interval $((n-1)^3, n^3)$ grows at least as $n^{0.425}$*

Proof. According to the Quasi-Legendre's theorem, starting from $C = p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq x_0 < p_r$, the intervals $((n-1)^{\frac{40}{19}}, n^{\frac{40}{19}})$ contain at least one prime. Let us estimate the number of such intervals in $((n-1)^3, n^3)$. The number of such intervals T can be estimated the following way:

$$T = [(n^3)^{\frac{19}{40}}] - [((n-1)^3)^{\frac{19}{40}}] - 1 = [n^{\frac{57}{40}} - [(n-1)^{\frac{57}{40}}] - 1 = n^{\frac{57}{40}} - (n-1)^{\frac{57}{40}} + \theta \tag{20}$$

where $|\theta| \leq 3$. $T > n^{\frac{17}{40}} + \theta = n^{0.425} + \theta$. Since each interval $((n-1)^{\frac{40}{19}}, n^{\frac{40}{19}})$ contain at least one prime, the number of primes increases with n as $n^{0.425}$. □

3.3 Legendre's Conjecture and Andrica's Conjecture

Theorem 14. *There exists a constant $C(L)$ such that for each integer $n > C(L)$ there is a prime number q where $n - 2\sqrt{n} - 1 < q < n$.*

Theorem 15. *There exists a constant $C(L)$ such that for each integer $n > C(L)$ there is a prime number q where $p - 2\sqrt{p} - 1 < q < p$.*

Lemma 5. *Theorem 14 is true for all $n > C(L)$ if and only if theorem 15 is true for all prime $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(L) < p_r$.*

Proof. Let theorem 14 be true for all integer $n > C(L)$ then theorem 15 is true for all prime $p \geq p_r$. Let theorem 15 be true for all prime $p \geq p_r$ but theorem 14 is false some integer $n > p_r$. Let n_0 be the minimal integer such that an interval $(n_0 - 2\sqrt{n_0} - 1, n_0)$ contains no prime numbers.

Let p_{n-1}, p_n be two neighbouring primes such that $p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$; then the interval $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Indeed the interval (n_0, p_n) does not contain any prime numbers and the interval $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, n_0) \subset (n_0 - 2\sqrt{n} - 1, n_0)$, also doesn't contain any prime numbers, since $n_0 - 2\sqrt{n_0} < p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n}$. Thus $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$ does not contain any primes leading to a contradiction. □

Lemma 6. *Theorem 15 is true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(L) < p_r$ if and only if every pair of neighbouring primes p_{n-1} and $p_n \geq p_r$ satisfies the following inequality:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1 \tag{21}$$

Proof. Let theorem 15 be true for all primes $p_n \geq p_r$, then for $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$ there is q belonging to the interval where $q \leq p_{n-1} < p_n$ and p_{n-1} also belongs to $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$. Thus:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n - (p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1) = 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1 \tag{22}$$

Let the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1$ be true for $p_n \geq p_r$ then $p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1 < p_{n-1} < p_n$ and $p_{n-1} \in (p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$. Thus the interval $(p_n - 2\sqrt{p_n} - 1, p_n)$ contains a prime number. □

Theorem 16. *Legendre's conjecture is true if theorem 14 is true.*

Proof. Let theorem 14 be true, then for any $n > C(L)$ there is a prime p belonging to the interval $(n - 2\sqrt{n} - 1, n)$. Let n be the square, i.e. $n = m^2$. Then there is a prime p in the interval $(m^2 - 2m - 1, m^2)$. Since p is a prime, it belongs to the interval $((m-1)^2, m^2)$. As m^2 is any positive integer greater than C, Legendre's conjecture is true. □

In general it is possible for Legendre's conjecture to be true while theorem 15 is false. Let us introduce the so-called Legendre prime numbers. A prime number p_n is a Legendre prime if $p_n > a^2 > p_{n-1}$ for some integer a. $\Pi_L = \{l_1 = 2, l_2 = 5, l_3 = 11, l_4 = 17, l_5 = 29, l_6 = 37, l_7 = 53, l_8 = 67, l_9 = 83, l_{10} = 101, l_{11} = 127, ...\}$ is the set of Legendre's prime numbers.

Theorem 17. *Legendre's conjecture is true if theorem 15 is true for Legendre's prime numbers.*

Proof. Let theorem 15 be true for Legendre's prime numbers $l_k \geq l_r \in \Pi_L$ and Legendre's conjecture is false. Let $n_0 > l_r$ be the minimal integer such that an interval $((n_0 - 1)^2, n_0^2)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Then the interval $(n_0^2 - 2n_0 - 1, n_0^2)$ doesn't contain any primes. Let us take Legendre's prime number $l_{n_0} > n_0^2$ then the interval $(l_{n_0} - 2\sqrt{l_{n_0}} - 1, l_{n_0})$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. We have the contradiction with the condition of theorem 17, since we assume theorem 17 to be true over the set of Legendre primes. □

Note: Using these results we can give Legendre's conjecture the following algebraic representation:

Corollary 1. *Let n and l_n belong to the natural numbers and Legendre's prime numbers correspondently. Legendre's conjecture is true if and only if the map $f : n \to l_n$ where $l_{n-1} < n^2 < l_n$ is one-to-one.*

Proof. Let Legendre's conjecture be true, then for each interval $((n-1)^2, n^2)$ there is a prime number $p \in ((n-1)^2, n^2)$. Then p is either a Legendre prime or there is a prime $q \in ((n-1)^2, p)$ such that the interval $((n-1)^2, q)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers and therefore q is a Legendre prime. Thus we have a map which is strictly increasing so the map is one-to-one.

Let the map $f : n \to l_n$ be one-to-one, then for any $n-1, n$ there are p, q such that $(n-1)^2 < p$ and $n^2 < q$ and the intervals $((n-1)^2, p), (n^2, q)$ do not contain any primes. Therefore p belongs to the interval $((n-1)^2, n^2)$. Thus Legendre's conjecture is true. □

Theorem 18. *Legendre's conjecture is true if for any pair p_{n-1}, p_n where p_n is Legendre's prime number holds the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1$*

Proof. Proof: Theorem 18 is true due to theorems 14, 15, 16, 17 and lemmas 5, 6. □

Note: In 1986 year author of paper [1] had given the following conjecture: for all pairs neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n takes place the inequality (Andrica's conjecture):

$$\sqrt{p_n} - \sqrt{p_{n-1}} < 1. \tag{23}$$

All empirical evidence up to 10^{16} confirms that Andrica's conjecture is true.

Theorem 19 (Legendre's conjecture)**.** *Let Andrica's conjecture, $\sqrt{p_k} - \sqrt{p_{k-1}} < 1$, hold for each pair of neighbouring primes p_{k-1}, p_k where p_k is a Legendre's prime, then for each integer n there is a prime p such that $(n-1)^2 < p < n^2$.*

Proof. Using Andrica's conjecture we have the following inequality:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p_{n-1}} < 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1 \tag{24}$$

Therefore due to theorem 18 under the assumption that the weak Andrica conjecture is true we can conclude that Legendre's conjecture is true. □

Note: P. Rainboum in his book "The Little Book of Bigger Primes" writes: "... Here is another open problem: to show that $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n}) = 0$. If true, this would establish (for n sufficiently large) the conjecture of D.Andrica that $\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} < 1$ for all $n \geq 1$. In turn, from this inequality, if true, it would follow that between the squares of any two consecutive integers, there is always a prime. This seems indeed true, but has yet to be proved. Note that this is weaker than Opperman's conjecture..." [13]

Note: Legendre's conjecture can be considered without any connection to Andrica's conjecture since one is only a sufficient condition. However if Legendre's conjecture is false then Andrica's conjecture is also false.

Conjecture 1. *For each pair of neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n where p_n belongs to a set of Legendre's prime numbers* (Π_L) *then:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < 2\sqrt{p_n} + 1. \tag{25}$$

Conjecture 2 (Strong Lengendre conjecture)**.** *For any integer n there exist at least two prime numbers p, q where $(n-1)^2 < p, q < n^2$.*

Theorem 20. *The strong Legendre's conjecture is true if and only if for any n, $l_n, l_{n+1} \in \Pi_L$ are not $p_k, p_{k+1} \in \Pi$ for any k.*

Proof. Let n be an integer and $p, q \in \Pi_L$ be a pair of neighbouring primes. Assume that p, q are not a pair $p_k, p_{k+1} \in \Pi$. Then $(n-1)^2 < p < n^2 < q$ and there is a prime number r such that $p < r < q$, which implies that the strong Legendre conjecture is true.

Let the strong Legendre conjecture be true, then for any integer n there exist two primes r, s such that $(n-1)^2 < r < s < n^2$. But there are also two Legendre primes p, q such that $(n-1)^2 < p \leq r < s < n^2 < q$, therefore the pair p, q is not a pair p_k, p_{k+1} in Π. □

3.4 Oppermann's Conjecture and the Modified Andrica's Conjecture

Conjecture 3 (Oppermann's Conjecture)**.** *For any integer $n > 1$ there exist two primes p, q where $n^2 < p < n^2 + n$ and $n^2 + n < q < (n+1)^2$.*

Although we don't have any instruments for proving Oppermann's conjecture however if we will use modified Andrica's conjecture, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n}) = 0$, then we can prove the following.

Theorem 21. *There exists such a constant $C(O)$ that for any $n > C(O)$ there are at least two primes p, q such that $n^2 < p < n^2 + n$ and $n^2 + n < q < (n+1)^2$.*

Proof.

Theorem 22. *There exists an integer $C(O)$ such that for each integer $n > C(O)$ there are two prime numbers p, q such that $n - \sqrt{n} < p < n$ and $n < q < n + \sqrt{n}$.*

Theorem 23. *There exists an integer $C(O)$ such that for each prime $l > C(O)$ there are two prime numbers p, q such that $l - \sqrt{l} < p < l$ and $l < q < l + \sqrt{l}$.*

Lemma 7. *Theorem 22 is true for all integers $n > C(O)$ if and only if theorem 23 is true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(O) < p_r$.*

Proof. Let theorem 22 be true for all integers $n > C(O)$ then theorem 23 is true for all primes $p \geq p_r$. Let theorem 23 be true for all prime $p \geq p_r$ but theorem 22 is false for some integer $n > p_r$.

- Case 1: Let n_0 be the minimal integer such that the interval $(n_0 - \sqrt{n_0}, n_0)$ contains no primes. Let p_{n-1}, p_n be two neighbouring prime numbers where $p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$. Then the interval $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Indeed the interval (n_0, p_n) doesn't contain any primes and the interval $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, n_0) \subset (n_0 - \sqrt{n_0}, n_0)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers since $n_0 - \sqrt{n_0} < p_n - \sqrt{p_n}$. Thus $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers.
- Case 2: let n_0 be the minimal integer such that an interval $(n_0, n_0 + \sqrt{n_0})$ doesn't contain any primes. Let p_{m-1}, p_m be two neighbouring prime numbers where $p_r \leq p_{m-1} < n_0 < p_m$, then the interval $(p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$ doesn't contain any primes. Indeed the interval (p_{m-1}, n_0) doesn't contain any primes and the interval $(n_0, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}}) \subset (n_0, n_0 + \sqrt{n_0})$ also contains no primes since $p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}} < n_0 + \sqrt{n_0}$. Thus $(p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$ doesn't contain any prime numbers leading to a contradiction with the condition of lemma 7.

□

Lemma 8. *Theorem 23 is true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(O) < p_r$ if and only if any pairs of neighbouring prime numbers $p_{n-1}, p_n, p_{m-1}, p_m \geq p_r$ satisfy the following inequalities*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \sqrt{p_n} \tag{26}$$

$$p_m - p_{m-1} < \sqrt{p_{m-1}} \tag{27}$$

Proof. Let theorem 23 be true for all primes $p_n \geq p_r$.

- Case 1: let p belong to the interval $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$ since $p \leq p_{n-1} < p_n$ then p_{n-1} also belongs to $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$. Therefore:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n - (p_n - \sqrt{p_n}) = \sqrt{p_n} \tag{28}$$

  Let the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < \sqrt{p_n}$ be true for every $p_n \geq p_r$, then $p_n - \sqrt{p_n} < p_{n-1} < p_n$ and $p_{n-1} \in (p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$. Thus the interval $(p_n - \sqrt{p_n}, p_n)$ contains a prime number.

- Case 2: let q belong to the interval $(p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$ since $p_{m-1} < p_m \leq q$ then p_m also belongs to the interval $(p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$. Hence, $p_m - p_{m-1} < (p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}}) - p_{m-1} = \sqrt{p_{m-1}}$

  Let the inequality $p_m - p_{m-1} < \sqrt{p_{m-1}}$ be true for each $p_{m-1} \geq p_r$, then $p_{m-1} < p_m < p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}}$ and $p_m \in (p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$. Therefore, the interval $(p_{m-1}, p_{m-1} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}})$ contains a prime number.

□

Theorem 24. *Theorem 22 is true if for any pair $p_{n-1}, p_n \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(O) < p_r$ satisfies the inequalities:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \sqrt{p_n} \tag{29}$$

$$p_m - p_{m-1} < \sqrt{p_{m-1}} \tag{30}$$

Proof. Theorem 24 is true due to theorem 23 and lemmas 7, 8. □

Theorem 25. *The theorem 21 is true if theorem 22 is true.*

Proof. Let theorem 22 be true then for any $n > C(O)$ there are prime numbers p, q which belong to the intervals $(n - \sqrt{n}, n), (n, n + \sqrt{n})$ correspondingly. Let us take $n = (m+1)^2$ for the first bracket and $n = m^2$ for the second bracket. We then have $m^2 + m < p < (m+1)^2$ and $m^2 < q < m^2 + m$ correspondingly. □

Theorem 26. *Let the modified Andrica's conjecture be true then there exists such a constant $C(O)$ that for any pairs of neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n and $p_{m-1}, p_m > C(O)$ the following inequalities hold:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \sqrt{p_n} \tag{31}$$

$$p_m - p_{m-1} < \sqrt{p_{m-1}} \tag{32}$$

Proof. Let $d_{m-1} = p_m - p_{m-1}$, and let $S = \{m \in \mathbb{N} | d_{m-1} > \sqrt{p_{m-1}}\}$ be a conflicting set. Let $\#S = \infty$. However, if we evaluate the expression $d_{m-1} > \sqrt{p_{m-1}}$ we will have:

$$\sqrt{p_m} - \sqrt{p_{m-1}} > \frac{\sqrt{p_{m-1}}}{\sqrt{p_m} + \sqrt{p_{m-1}}} > \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}+1} \text{ for all } m \text{ in the set } S\,. \tag{33}$$

However, this would be a contradiction of the modified Andrica's conjecture, which we assumed to be true (as it would violate Weierstrass' conditions about subsequences), leading us to conclude that $\#S$ was finite. □

This in turn implies that theorem 21 is true due to theorems 25 and 26. □

Corollary 2. *For any integer n there is a prime p with $n^2 < p < n^2 + n$ if and only if the interval $(n^2, n^2 + n)$ contains Legendre prime number l_n.*

Corollary 3. *The estimate of the difference between consecutive Legendre prime numbers l_{n-1}, l_n has the following form: $n < l_n - l_{n-1} < 3n - 1$*

3.5 Diophantine inequality and Cramer's Conjecture

"So what Cramer seems to be suggesting, on probabilistic grounds, is that the largest gap between consecutive primes x is $\log^2 x$; more precisely,

$$\max_{p_{n-1}<x}(p_n - p_{n-1}) \approx \log^2 x. \tag{34}$$

This statement (or the weaker $O(\log^2 x)$) is known as 'Cramer's Conjecture'." [7]. Cramer's conjecture has also gotten some experimental support and the authors of works [9], [4], [8] believe one can hope that Cramer's conjecture is true.

Our goal to show that if Cramer's conjecture is true then the following theorem is true.

Theorem 27 (Conditional Theorem)**.** *For any real ϵ where $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ there exists a constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that for each integer $n > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number p where $(n-1)^{1+\epsilon} < p < n^{1+\epsilon}$.*

Proof.

Theorem 28. *For any real ϵ, $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ there exists a constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that for each integer $n > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number q such that $n - (0.5+\epsilon)n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < q < n$.*

Theorem 29. *For any real ϵ, $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ there exists a constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that for each prime $p > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number q such that $p - (0.5+\epsilon)p^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < q < p$.*

Lemma 9. *Theorem 28 is true for all integers $n > C(\epsilon)$ if and only if theorem 29 is true for all primes $p > C(\epsilon)$.*

Proof. Let theorem 28 be true then theorem 29 is also true for all primes $p > C(\epsilon)$. Let theorem 29 be true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(\epsilon) < p_r$ but theorem 28 is false for some integers.

Let n_0 be the minimal rational integer such that the interval $(n_0 - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)n_0^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, n_0)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Let p_{n-1}, p_n be a pair neighbouring primes and $p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$ then the interval $(p_n - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers.

Indeed the interval (n_0, p_n) doesn't contain any prime numbers and $(p_n - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, n_0) \subset (n_0 - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)n_0^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, n_0)$ where $n_0 - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)n_0^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < p_n - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Thus $(p_n - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. We have a contradiction. □

Theorem 30. *Let theorem 28 be true then the Conditional Theorem is true.*

Proof. Let theorem 28 be true then for any integer $n > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number p with $n - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < p < n$. Let an integer n be equal to $n = [m^{1+\epsilon}]$ where $m^{1+\epsilon} - 1 < n \leq m^{1+\epsilon}$. Then there is a prime q belonging to $([m^{1+\epsilon}] - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)[m^{1+\epsilon}]^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, [m^{1+\epsilon}])$. Since $([m^{1+\epsilon}] - (\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)[m^{1+\epsilon}]^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, [m^{1+\epsilon}]) \subset ((m-1)^{1+\epsilon}, m^{1+\epsilon})$ so $q \in ((m-1)^{1+\epsilon}, m^{1+\epsilon})$. Thus theorem 30 is true. □

Theorem 31. *Theorem 29 is true if and only if there exists a constant $C(\epsilon)$ such that every pair of neighbouring prime numbers $p_{n-1}, p_n \geq C(\epsilon)$ satisfies the following inequality*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < (0.5 + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} \tag{35}$$

Proof. Let theorem 29 be true for all primes $p_n \geq C(\epsilon)$, so for the interval $(p_n - (\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, p_n)$ there is q belonging to this interval and $q \leq p_{n-1} < p_n$ and p_{n-1} also belongs to this interval. Thus:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n - (p_n - (0.5 + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}) = (0.5 + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}. \tag{36}$$

Let $p_n - p_{n-1} < (\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}$ be true for any pair neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(\epsilon)$ then $p_n - (\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < p_{n-1} < p_n$ and p_{n-1} belongs to $(p_n - (\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}, p_n)$. Thus this interval contains a prime number. □

Theorem 32. *For any real ϵ where $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ there exists an integer $C(\epsilon)$ such that for each for every pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(\epsilon)$ the following inequality takes place:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < (0.5 + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}. \tag{37}$$

Proof. Let Cramer's conjecture [3] be true then there exists such a constant C that for all prime numbers p_n, p_{n-1} the following inequality holds: $p_n - p_{n-1} < C \ln^2 p_{n-1}$. Furthermore there exists such n_0 that for all $n > n_0 + 1$ the following inequality takes place:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < C \ln^2 p_{n-1} < (0.5 + \epsilon)p_{n-1}^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}} < (0.5 + \epsilon)p_n^{\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}}. \tag{38}$$

Thus we can take $C(\epsilon)$ as equal to p_{n_0}. □

Therefore, the conditional theorem is true for all integers $n > C(\epsilon) = p_{n_0}$ due to theorems 28, 30. □

Conjecture 4. *For any real ϵ where $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ there exists such an integer $C(\epsilon)$ that for each integer $n > C(\epsilon)$ there is a prime number p with $(n-1)^{1+\epsilon} < p < n^{1+\epsilon}$.*

Note: Given conjecture can consider without any connection to Cramer's conjecture since one is only a sufficient condition. However if given conjecture is false even though for one value ϵ then Cramer's conjecture also is false.

Theorem 33. *The modified Andrica's conjecture, $\lim_{n\to\infty}(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n}) = 0$ is true if the weak Cramer conjecture, $p_n - p_{n-1} = O(\ln^2 p_{n-1})$, is true.*

Proof. According to the weak Cramer's conjecture there exists such a constant C that for all prime numbers p_n, p_{n-1}, the following inequality takes place:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < C \ln^2 p_{n-1} \tag{39}$$

Furthermore, we get the following inequality:

$$\sqrt{p_n} - \sqrt{p_{n-1}} < C\frac{\ln^2 p_{n-1}}{\sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p_{n-1}}} < C\frac{\ln^2 p_n}{p_n} \tag{40}$$

and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} = 0$. Thus modified Andrica's conjecture is true. □

Note: Given theorem can consider without any connection to Cramer's conjecture since one is only a sufficient condition. However if modified Andrica's conjecture is false then Cramer's conjecture also is false.

3.6 Fractional theorem

Theorem 34 (Fractional theorem)**.** *For any real $k \geq 2$ there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there are two primes p, q such that $\frac{k-1}{k}n < p, q < \frac{k}{k-1}n$.*

Theorem 35. *For any real $k \geq 2$ there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there is a prime number p where $n < p < \frac{k}{k-1}n$.*

Theorem 36. *For any real $k \geq 2$ there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each integer $n > C(k)$ there is a prime number p where $\frac{k-1}{k}n < p < n$.*

Theorem 37. *For any real $k \geq 2$ there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each prime $n > C(k)$ there is a prime number p where $n < p < \frac{k}{k-1}n$.*

Theorem 38. *For any real $k \geq 2$ there exists a computable constant $C(k)$ such that for each prime $n > C(k)$ there is a prime number p where $\frac{k-1}{k}n < p < n$.*

Lemma 10. *Theorem 35 is true for all integers $n > C(k)$ if and only if theorem 37 also is true for all primes $n > C(k)$.*

Proof. Let theorem 35 be true then theorem 37 is true for all prime $n > C(k)$. Let theorem 37 be true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(k) < p_r$ but theorem 35 is false for some integers. Let n_0 be the minimal natural number such that an interval $(n_0, \frac{k}{k-1}n_0)$ contains no prime numbers. Let p_{n-1}, p_n be a pair neighbouring primes such that $C(k) < p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$ then the interval $(p_{n-1}, (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1})$ doesn't have any prime numbers. Indeed the interval (p_{n-1}, n_0) doesn't contain any prime numbers nor does the interval $(n_0, (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1}) \subset (n_0, (\frac{k}{k-1})n_0)$. Thus $(p_{n-1}, \frac{k}{k-1}p_{n-1})$ doesn't contain any prime numbers which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 39. *Theorem 37 is true if and only if there is such a constant $C(k)$ that for every pair of neighbouring prime numbers $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$ the following inequality is satisfied:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1} \tag{41}$$

Proof. Let theorem 37 be true, then the interval $(p_{n-1}, (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1})$ contains a prime number q such that $p_{n-1} < p_n \leq q$ and p_n belongs to this interval. Thus we have:

$$p_{n-1} < p_n < (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1} \text{ and } p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1} \tag{42}$$

Let the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1}$ be true for any pair prime number then: $p_{n-1} < p_n < p_{n-1} + \frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1}$ and p_n belongs to the interval $(p_{n-1}, (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1})$. Thus any interval $(p_{n-1}, (\frac{k}{k-1})p_{n-1})$ contains a prime number. □

Theorem 40. *Theorem 35 is true if and only if for any pair neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$ the following inequality holds:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1} \tag{43}$$

Proof. Theorem 40 is true due to theorems 37, 39 and lemma 10. □

Lemma 11. *Theorem 36 is true for all integers $n > C(k)$ if and only if theorem 38 is true for all prime $n > C(k)$.*

Proof. Let theorem 36 be true then theorem 38 is true for all prime $n > C(k)$. Let theorem 38 be true for all primes $p \geq p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(k) < p_r$ but theorem 36 is false for some integers.

Let n_0 be the minimal natural number such that an interval $(\frac{k-1}{k}n_0, n_0)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Let p_{n-1}, p_n be a pair of neighbouring primes $C(k) < p_r \leq p_{n-1} < n_0 < p_n$ then the interval $(\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$ doesn't have any prime numbers. Indeed the interval (n_0, p_n) doesn't contain any prime numbers and the interval $(\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, n_0) \subset (\frac{k-1}{k}n_0, n_0)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers. Therefore, $(\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$ doesn't contain any prime numbers, leading to a contradiction. □

Theorem 41. *Theorem 38 is true if and only if there is such a constant $C(k)$ that for every pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$ the following inequality holds:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n}{k} \tag{44}$$

Proof. Let theorem 38 be true, then the interval $q \in (\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$ then $q \leq p_{n-1} < p_n$ and p_{n-1} also belongs to the interval $(\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$. Thus we have

$$p_n - \frac{p_n}{k} < p_{n-1} < p_n \text{ and } p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n}{k} \tag{45}$$

Let the inequality $p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n}{k}$ be true then:

$$\frac{k-1}{k}p_n = p_n - \frac{p_n}{k} < p_{n-1} < p_n \tag{46}$$

and $p_{n-1} \in (\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$. Therefore, the interval $(\frac{k-1}{k}p_n, p_n)$ contains a prime. □

Theorem 42. *Theorem 36 is true if and only if for any pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(k)$ satisfy the inequality:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_n}{k} \tag{47}$$

Proof. Theorem 42 is true due to theorems 38, 41 and lemma 11. □

Theorem 43. *The fractional theorem is true if there is such an integer C that every pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C$ satisfies the following inequalities:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \min(\frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1}, \frac{p_n}{k}). \tag{48}$$

Proof. If there is a C such that for each pair neighbouring prime numbers $p_{n-1}, p_n > C$ satisfy:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \min(\frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1}, \frac{p_n}{k}). \tag{49}$$

Then theorems 35, 36 will be satisfied and the fractional theorem will also be true. □

Theorem 44. *There exists an integer C that that for every pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C$ the following inequality takes place*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \min(\frac{p_{n-1}}{k-1}, \frac{p_n}{k}). \tag{50}$$

Proof. Since $\frac{p_{n-1}}{k} < \min(\frac{p_{n-1}}{k-}, \frac{p_n}{k})$ we will estimate C using $p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k}$.

Indeed using one of Proposition 1.10 from [5] (For $k > 463$, $p_{k+1} \leq p_k(1 + \frac{1}{\ln^2 p_k})$) we have the following inequality:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} \leq \frac{p_{n-1}}{\ln^2 p_{n-1}} \tag{51}$$

Thus our problem is to find such n_0 that for all $n > n_0 + 1$ the following holds:

$$\frac{p_{n-1}}{\ln^2 p_{n-1}} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{k} \tag{52}$$

Since $\ln(p_n)$ is a strictly increasing function so there exist such n_0 that for any $n > n_0 + 1$ this inequality takes place. Thus we have the following estimate for $C(k)$:

$$C(k) = \max(p_r, p_{465}), \text{ where } p_{r-1} < \exp(\sqrt{k}) < p_r \text{ and } n_0 = max(r + 1, 465). \tag{53}$$

□

Theorem 45. *The fractional theorem is true for all integers $n > C(k) = max(p_r, p_{465})$, where $p_{r-1} < \exp(\sqrt{k}) < p_r$*

Proof. Theorem 45 is true due to theorems 43, 44. □

3.6.1 Application of the fractional theorem

Theorem 46 (Strong theorem (exponent 3))**.** *There exists a computable integer C such that for each integer $n > C$ there are at the least two primes p, q such that $(n-1)^3 < p, q < n^3$.*

Proof.

Lemma 12. *Let $k = \frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{g^{\frac{3}{2}} - (g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}$ where $k > 2$ and g is an integer, then there exists a computable integer $C(g)$ such that for each integer $n > C(g)$:*

$$(\frac{g-1}{g})^{\frac{3}{2}} n < p, q < (\frac{g}{g-1})^{\frac{3}{2}} n \tag{54}$$

Proof. Lemma 10 is true due to theorem 45. □

According to the paper [2] there exist n_0, x_0 such that for $n > n_0 + 1$ it would follow $p_{n-1}, p_n > x_0$ and the following inequality holds:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} \tag{55}$$

Lemma 13. *Let $g > x_0$ then there exists such an integer $C(g)$ such that for all $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(g)$ we have:*

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{(\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}})})} \tag{56}$$

Proof. Our goal to give an estimate of $C(g)$. Since $n > n_0 + 1$, then

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} \tag{57}$$

Our problem is to find $C(g)$ when for each $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(g)$ the following inequality is satisfied:

$$p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{(\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}})})} \tag{58}$$

or

$$\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}} < (\frac{p_{n-1}}{p_n})^{\frac{21}{40}} p_{n-1}^{\frac{19}{40}} \tag{59}$$

and finally:

$$(\frac{p_n}{p_{n-1}})^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}})^{\frac{40}{19}} < 2^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}}})^{\frac{40}{19}} < p_{n-1} \tag{60}$$

Then $2^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{g^{\frac{3}{2}}}{(g^{\frac{3}{2}}-(g-1)^{\frac{3}{2}})})^{\frac{40}{19}} < 3g^{\frac{40}{19}}$ and we can take $C(g) = 3g^2([g^{\frac{2}{19}}] + 1)$ □

Lemma 14. *The interval $(C(g), (g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}})$ contains at least two prime numbers.*

Proof. According to Bertrand's postulate the interval $(C(g), 2C(g))$ contains at least two or more prime numbers [14], [12]. Let us show that $2C(g) < (g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Indeed, $2C(g) < 6(g^{\frac{40}{19}} + g^2) < (g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}}$ already takes place when $g > 20$. □

Let us take C equal to p_r where $p_{r-1} \leq C(g) < p_r$. Since for any integer $n > p_r$ the fractional theorem is true and as $(g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}} > p_r$. We can choose n_0 such that $|n_0 - (g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}}| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Thus $n_0 = (g(g-1))^{\frac{3}{2}} + \theta$, where $|\theta| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. And

$$(\frac{g-1}{g})^{\frac{3}{2}} n_0 = (g-1)^3 + \theta(\frac{g-1}{g})^{\frac{3}{2}} < p, q < (\frac{g}{g-1})^{\frac{3}{2}} n_0 = g^3 + \theta(\frac{g}{g-1})^{\frac{3}{2}} \tag{61}$$

We have $(g-1)^3 < p, q < g^3$ since the intervals $((g-1)^3, (g-1)^3 + |\theta|\frac{g-1}{g}^{\frac{3}{2}}), (g^3, g^3 + |\theta|\frac{g}{g-1}^{\frac{3}{2}})$ don't contain any integers, □

3.7 Brocard's conjecture

Conjecture 5 (Brocard's conjecture)**.** *For each pair of neighbouring primes p_{n-1}, p_n there are at the least four prime numbers p, q, r, s where $p_{n-1}^2 < p, q, r, s < p_n^2$.*

Theorem 47 (Brocard's theorem (exponent 3))**.** *There exists a computable integer $C(B)$ such that for each pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(B)$ there are at the least four primes p, q, r, s such that $p_{n-1}^3 < p, q, r, s < p_n^3$.*

Proof. Since any interval (p_{n-1}, p_n) can represent as a union $(p_{n-1}, p_n) = \cup_k(p_{n-1} + k, p_{n-1} + k + 1)$ where k runs from 0 to $p_n - p_{n-1} - 1$. Thus $(p_{n-1}^3, p_n^3) = \cup_k((p_{n-1} + k)^3, (p_{n-1} + k + 1)^3)$. The minimal number of such intervals is equal to two so any interval (p_{n-1}^3, p_n^3) contains at the least four prime numbers according to the Strong theorem (exponent 3). □

Theorem 48 (Strong Brocard's theorem (exponent 3))**.** *For any natural k there exists such a constant C(k) that for each prime $p_{n-1} > C(k)$ an interval (p_{n-1}^3, p_n^3) contains at the least 2k prime numbers.*

Proof. According to the lemma 4: There exists a computable integer C such that with increasing $n, n > C$ the number of the prime numbers in an interval $((n-1)^3, n^3)$ grows at the least as $n^{0.425}$. Let us take $n_0 > C$ and $n_0^{0.425} > k$ thus $C(k) = n_0 = [\max(C, k^{\frac{40}{17}})] + 1$. Let $p_{r-1} \leq n_0 < p_r$ then for any $m \geq r + 1$ the interval (p_{m-1}^3, p_m^3) contains at the least $2k$ prime numbers. □

Although today we don't have any instruments for proving Brocard's theorem exponent 2, nevertheless offered approach without using Legendre's conjecture permits us to get the following result:

Theorem 49 (Weak Brocard's theorem (exponent 2))**.** *There exists a computable integer C(B) such that for each pair of neighbouring primes $p_{n-1}, p_n > C(B)$ where $(p_n - p_{n-1}) > 3p_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}$ there are at the least two prime numbers p, q with $p_{n-1}^2 < p, q < p_n^2$.*

Proof.

Lemma 15. *Let $k = \frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}}$ where $k > 2$ then it exists a computable integer C(m) that for each integer $n > C(m)$ takes place:*

$$\frac{p_{m-1}}{p_m} n < p, q < \frac{p_m}{p_{m-1}} n \tag{62}$$

Proof. Lemma 15 is true due to theorem 45. □

According to the paper [2] there exist n_0, x_0 such that for $n > n_0 + 1$ it would follow $p_{n-1}, p_n > x_0$ and the following inequality takes place:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n^{\frac{21}{40}}. \tag{63}$$

Lemma 16. *Let $m, n > n_0 + 1$ then there exists such an integer C(m) that for each $p_{n-1} > C(m)$, $p_n - p_{n-1} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}}}$*

Proof. Our goal is to give an estimate of $C(m)$. Since $n > n_0$, we have that:

$$p_n - p_{n-1} < p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} \tag{64}$$

Our problem is to find $C(m)$ for $p_n > C(m)$ when the inequality holds:

$$p_n^{\frac{21}{40}} < \frac{p_{n-1}}{\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}}} \tag{65}$$

or

$$\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}} < (\frac{p_{n-1}}{p_n})^{\frac{21}{40}} p_{n-1}^{\frac{19}{40}} \tag{66}$$

and finally

$$(\frac{p_n}{p_{n-1}})^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}})^{\frac{40}{19}} < p_{n-1}. \tag{67}$$

Using the inequality $p_n < 2p_{n-1}$ we have the following estimate for $C(m)$:

$$C(m) = [2^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}})^{\frac{40}{19}}] + 1. \tag{68}$$

□

Lemma 17. *Let $p_m - p_{m-1} > 3p_{m-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}$ then the interval $(C(m), p_{m-1}p_m)$ contains at least two primes.*

Proof. According to Bertrand's postulate the interval $(C(m), 2C(m))$ contains at least two or more primes [14], [12]. Let us show that under the assumption that $(p_m - p_{m-1}) > 3p_{m-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}$ the following inequality takes place:

$$2C(m) < 2^{\frac{40}{19}}(\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}})^{\frac{40}{19}} + 2 < p_{m-1}p_m \tag{69}$$

Indeed if $p_m - p_{m-1} > 3p_{m-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}$ we have

$$\frac{2C(m)}{p_{m-1}p_m} < (\frac{p_m}{p_{m-1}})^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{2p_{m-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}}{p_m - p_{m-1}})^{\frac{40}{19}} + \frac{2}{p_{m-1}p_m} < 2^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{2}{3})^{\frac{40}{19}} + 0.02 < 1. \tag{70}$$

Thus the interval $(C(m), p_{m-1}p_m)$ contains at the least more than two primes. □

Lemma 18. *There exists such an integer C such that for each $n > C$ the following holds:*

$$\frac{p_{m-1}}{p_m}n < p, q < \frac{p_m}{p_{m-1}}n \tag{71}$$

Proof. Let us take $C = p_r$ where $p_{r-1} \leq C(m) < p_r$, $C(m) = [2^{\frac{21}{19}}(\frac{p_m}{p_m - p_{m-1}})^{\frac{40}{19}}] + 1$.

Since the inequality $\frac{p_{m-1}}{p_m}n < p, q < \frac{p_m}{p_{m-1}}n$ takes place for all primes $p_n > p_r$ so according to theorems 43, 44 this inequality is true for all natural $n \geq p_{r+1} > p_r$. □

Thus we can take n as equal to $p_{m-1}p_m$ and then we would have that the interval (p_{m-1}^2, p_m^2) contains at least two primes under the condition that the difference between consecutive primes satisfies the inequality $p_m - p_{m-1} > 3p_{m-1}^{\frac{1}{20}}$. □

References

[1] D. Andrica. Note on a conjecture in prime number theory. *Studia Univ. Babes-Bolyai Math.*, 31:44–48, 1986.

[2] R.C. Baker, G. Harman, and J. Pintz. The difference between consecutive primes ii. *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, 83(3):532–562, 2001.

[3] H. Cramér. On the order of magnitude of the difference between consecutive prime numbers. *Acta Arith*, 2:23–46, 1936.

[4] R. Crandall and C. Pomerance. *Prime Numbers*. Springer Science Business Media, 2005.

[5] Pierre Dusart. *Autor de la fonction qui compte le nombre de nombres premiers*. PhD thesis, Universite de Limoges, 1998.

[6] P. Erdős. On consecutive integers. *Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde*, 3:124–128, 1955.

[7] A. Granville. Harald cramer and the distribution of prime numbers. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal*, 1:12–28, 1995.

[8] A. Granville. Different approaches to the distribution of primes. *Milan Journal of Mathematics*, 78:1 – 25, 2009.

[9] D.R. Heath-Brown. Prime number theory and the riemann zeta-function. In *Lecture Note Series 322*, pages 1–30. London Mathematical Society, 2005.

[10] A. E. Ingham. On the difference between consecutive primes. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford*, 8:255–266, 1937.

[11] J. Pintz. Landau's problems on primes. *Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux*, 21(2):357–404, 2009.

[12] S. Ramanujan. A proof of bertrand's postulate. *J. Indian Math. Soc.*, 11:181–182, 1919.

[13] P. Ribenboim. *The Little Book of Bigger Primes*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.

[14] W. Sierpinski. *Elementary theory of numbers*. Warszawa, 1964.

[15] N. Tchudakoff. On the difference between two neighbouring prime numbers. *Recueil Mathematique*, 43(6):799–814, 1936.